

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1978

A comparative study in values feminists and anti-feminist

Patricia Elan Hall

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hall, Patricia Elan, "A comparative study in values feminists and anti-feminist" (1978). *Theses Digitization Project*. 51.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/51>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN VALUES:
FEMINISTS AND ANTI-FEMINISTS

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State College
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Psychology

by
Patricia Élan Hall



March, 1978

A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN VALUES:
FEMINISTS AND ANTI-FEMINISTS

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State College
San Bernardino

by
Patricia Élan Hall
March, 1978

Approved by:

<hr/>	<hr/>
Chairperson	Date
	
	
<hr/>	<hr/>

ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to test the differences between the values of feminist women and anti-feminist women. It was hypothesized that: (1) Feminists rate competency values more highly than anti-feminists, (2) anti-feminists rate moral values more highly than feminists, (3) anti-feminists rate adjustment values more highly than feminists, (4) anti-feminists rate ego-defensive values more highly than feminists, (5) feminists rate self-actualizing values more highly than anti-feminists, and (6) feminists rate social values more highly than anti-feminists. The 55 feminist subjects were chosen from the membership of National Organization for Women (NOW), and the 59 anti-feminists were active participants in a Fascinating Womanhood seminar. The Rokeach Value Survey provided the measure of values and a demographic information sheet was also used. The data supported the first five hypotheses, but no conclusions could be drawn on the sixth hypothesis. The demographic data showed that the feminist group was better educated than the anti-feminist group. A separate chi-square Median test was run on the data matched for education

level (N=76). It was established that the education factor alone was not enough to account for the wide differences between the two groups.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographic Differences Between Feminist Group and Anti-Feminist Group and Summary of Chi-Square.....	23
2. Composite Median Rankings of Feminist and Anti-Feminist Groups and Summary of Chi-Square Median Test.....	26
3. Summary of Chi-Square Median Test of Feminist and Anti-Feminist Groups Matched for Education.....	30
4. Comparison of Rank Ordering of Values Between Men and Women and Feminists and Anti-Feminists.....	41

A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN VALUES:

FEMINISTS AND ANTI-FEMINISTS

The movement toward the liberation of women has been with us since the turn of the century, regressing in the 1950's and early 1960's, and then gaining new momentum in the past 15 years. Women across the nation have begun to demand full equality with men and the right to pursue lives of their own. During this era of raised consciousness, a movement away from equality and self-reliance has been growing simultaneously, such that many women in America are divided into two opposing camps. On the one hand there are the feminist women who have formed consciousness-raising groups, such as the National Organization for Women (NOW), and similar organizations. This movement has produced statements of feminist philosophy such as The Feminine Mystique by Betty Friedan (1963), Born Female BY Caroline Bird (1970), and many others. On the other hand are the anti-feminist women who advocate the philosophies expressed in such works as Fascinating Womanhood by Helen B. Andelin (1965) and Total Woman by Marabel Morgan (1973); and women have attended seminars held nationally which train women in the techniques and philosophies of Fascinating Womanhood and Total Woman.

The concept of warring factions in any movement is not new. Any political revolution consists of "loyalists" and "revolutionaries". The freeing of the slaves in this country resulted in a division among American blacks; those that met their new freedom squarely and gratefully, and those that longed to return to the safety of slavery. The division among women, however, has unique qualities as well as common qualities with these other movements. Women and men are known colloquially as "loving enemies"; by the very nature of their need for each other, separatism is hardly a realistic or desirable solution to the problem (although there are radical feminists who maintain that such a solution is not only desirable, but viable). The pursuit of personal happiness and fulfillment are certainly a common goal of most women, but the fact that some choose the road of feminism and others choose the road of anti-feminism is intriguing. What are the significant elements that account for this striking difference? It is the purpose of this thesis to examine if differences in core values may account for the choice of feminism or anti-feminism.

The Feminine Mystique by Betty Friedan (1963) and Fascinating Womanhood by Helen Andelin (1965) both burst onto the American scene at very nearly the same point in time. Both books addressed themselves to the discon-

tented American housewife. Betty Friedan referred to this feeling as "the problem that has no name", and she stated:

If a woman had a problem in the 1950's and 1960's she knew that something must be wrong with her marriage, or with herself. Other women were satisfied with their lives, she thought. What kind of woman was she if she did not feel this mysterious fulfillment waxing the kitchen floor? She was so ashamed to admit her dissatisfaction that she never knew how many other women shared it. (p. 14)

Helen Andelin, in Fascinating Womanhood (1965), refers to this discontent of American Housewives as "a sea of darkness", and she states:

Never before in history has there been a generation of women so disillusioned, disappointed, and unhappy in marriage as in our times. Many feel that married life does not offer what they had hoped and dreamed it would. Some feel neglected, unappreciated, and often unloved. When they search for the answers, they feel lost in a sea of darkness. (p. 1)

Both authors gave voice to their nearly identical observations of a condition among married American women, and both posed the question, "Why is this so?" Up to and including that point they were very much in accord, but the ways in which each author attempted to answer this crucial question were strikingly polarized. Betty Friedan proposed that the reason married women were so desperately unhappy is that they have attempted to live their lives vicariously through others, and the solution to their discontent is to fulfill themselves in a more

direct manner, through personal growth and the utilization of their own potentials. Helen Andelin, on the other hand, maintains that the reason that American housewives have been so unhappy is that they have been too independent and self-centered, and that the road to happiness must be reached via total submersion in one's husband primarily and one's children secondarily.

If it is possible to pinpoint the beginning of this dichotomy among women, perhaps the publication of these two books is where it began. Since then, the differences have accumulated rapidly.

Women's relationship to men is a major factor in both the feminist and anti-feminist viewpoints, as indicated in the preceding paragraphs. The feminist viewpoint maintains that women have had their roles constructed for them by men for men, and that the socio/religious structure has been constructed in such a way as to keep women in bondage (Bird, 1968; Bem & Bem, 1971; Firestone, 1970; Friedan, 1963; Pierce, 1971; Weisstein, 1971). This thesis carries over into such far-reaching areas as science, psychology, anthropology, history, literature, medicine, sociology and many other areas to suggest a tightly woven, almost impenetrable network of masculine bias coupled with masculine interest. Less radical feminists see this sociological network as a trap that has served to helplessly enslave men as

well as women, and often refer to the liberation movement as "human liberation" rather than "women's liberation". The anti-feminist movement, on the other hand, believes that the role of women has been defined and ordained by God and "Natural Law", assigning to women the role of helpmate and companion. This role ascribes to women the subordinate position in marriage. The husband is considered the head of the household, and the wife is expected to yield to his decisions and devote the major portion of her energies to making his life comfortable (Andelin, 1965; Morgan, 1973).

One of the factors which is readily apparent in these differing interpretations of women's role is the acceptance or non-acceptance of religious doctrine. The feminist movement is much less inclined to accept religious doctrine on faith than is the anti-feminist movement (Andelin, 1965; Morgan, 1973; Bem & Bem, 1971). The validity of religious tenets that discriminate against women as being divinely inspired has been seriously questioned by the feminist community. They point out that Judeo-Christian doctrine was written by men, and speculate that vested interests might have played an equal part with divine interest in the construction of such doctrine (Bem & Bem, 1971). The anti-feminist movement adheres to the religious tenet that places women in a position of subservience. Helen Andelin,

in Fascinating Womanhood (1965), quotes the Bible frequently, as in Peter: "Ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands," (p. 131), and Paul: "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church. Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything" (p. 132).

The institution of marriage has been drastically affected by the feminist/anti-feminist movements. The ways in which these two movements conceptualize marriage are extremely complex, and do not lend themselves well to clear-cut dichotomies. Some feminists propose the possibility of a new "equalitarian" marriage. Other feminists are pessimistic about the future of marriage, seeing marriage itself as a political/power play designed primarily for the benefit of men. There are any number of differing opinions on the state and the art of marriage among feminists, but most would agree on the general idea that traditional marriages are not beneficial to women and if an equalitarian marriage is unachievable, it is best to end the marriage (Cronan, 1973; Bernard, 1971). Anti-feminists, on the other hand, generally agree that traditional marriage is more desirable than equalitarian marriage, and that the institution of marriage should be preserved at almost any cost (Andelin, 1965; Morgan, 1973).

Both Helen Andelin in Fascinating Womanhood (1965) and Marabel Morgan in Total Woman (1973) came upon their techniques while trying to save their own marriages, and their books and seminars openly appeal to women who are in fear of losing their husbands or are unhappy over the state of their marriages. These books and seminars advocate a return to the traditional, subservient female role as the solution to marital discord. The feminist movement deals with the dissatisfaction with marriage by insisting on equality.

The relationship between men and women, married or otherwise, advocated by feminists is based on an equalitarian approach. Personal honesty is encouraged, while manipulation is discouraged. Role-playing is discouraged as a form of dishonesty. Freedom to be and to do is perceived as the natural right of both persons in the relationship. There is an emphasis on the sharing of lives rather than the merging into one life. The loved person is loved for his/her unique qualities rather than for what that person is able to provide. These values closely parallel Abraham Maslow's criteria for growth-motivated persons. In Toward a Psychology of Being (1968) he states:

Idiographic, aesthetic perception of the whole person is far more possible for self-actualizing people (or in moments of self-actualization), and furthermore approval, admiration, and love are based less upon

gratitude for usefulness and more upon the objective, intrinsic qualities of the perceived person. He is admired for objectively admirable qualities rather than because he flatters or praises. He is loved because he is love worthy rather than because he gives out love. (p. 36)

Maslow's position is in striking contrast to the attitudes toward marriage advocated by the anti-feminists. Both Total Woman (Morgan, 1973) and Fascinating Womanhood (Andelin, 1965) state unequivocally that all women want from marriage is to be loved, and what all men want from marriage is to be admired. The thrust of their own love needs by first administering to their husbands' admiration needs. As Helen Andelin states in Fascinating Womanhood: "Cast your bread upon the waters and it will come back buttered" (p. 171). This attitude closely resembles Abraham Maslow's (1968) description of the deficit motivated individual:

In essence, the deficit-motivated man is far more dependent upon other people than is the man who is predominantly growth-motivated. He is more "interested", more needful, more attached, more desirous.

This dependency colors and limits interpersonal relations. To see people primarily as need-gratifiers or as sources of supply is an abstractive act. They are seen not as wholes, as complicated, unique individuals, but rather from the point of view of usefulness. What in them is not related to the perceiver's needs is either overlooked altogether, or else bores, irritates, or threatens. This parallels our relations with cows, horses, and sheep; as well as with waiters, taxicab drivers, porters, policemen or others whom we use. (p. 36)

Feminists and anti-feminists differ drastically in how they view the capabilities of women. Anti-feminists view women as passive, physically weak, fearful, emotional, and subjective. In Fascinating Womanhood Andelin (1965) states:

The great danger of today is that of sexual assault and in connection with it...the threat to life itself...There are also unreal dangers which many women are afraid of. Amusing as it is, women are still afraid of such things as lightning, thunder, strange noises, spiders, mice, and even dark shadows...whether the danger is real or not, if the woman thinks it is real, she will feel a need for masculine protection. (pp. 151-152)

Because of her weaker physical structure, a woman needs protection from strenuous work such as lifting heavy objects, moving furniture, mowing the lawn, painting, repairing mechanical equipment, carpentry and other rough work. This heavy work can be injurious to women, physically and lessen her feminine qualities. (p. 152)

There are difficulties of a different type for which she needs masculine assistance. These are such things as financial entanglements, belligerent creditors, or any dealings with people who are harsh, offensive, imposing, or who make unreasonable demands. Here is the "maiden in distress", dependent upon masculine chivalry. Women tend to be emotional and less objective in dealing with this type of assault than are men. For this reason they need the man to step in and cope with the situation. (p. 152)

Feminists maintain that women can be just as capable, strong, independent, courageous, and enduring as men; as expressed in the words of the former slave, Sojourner Truth, spoken almost a century ago:

The man over there says that women need to be helped into carriages and lifted over ditches, and to have the best place everywhere. Nobody ever helps me into carriages or over puddles or gives me the best place ...and ain't I a woman? Look at my arm! I have ploughed and planted and gathered into barns, and no man could head me... and ain't I a woman? I could work as much and eat as much as a man...when I could get it...and bear the lash as well...and ain't I a woman? I have born thirteen children and seen most of 'em sold into slavery, and when I cried out with my mother's grief, none but Jesus heard me...and ain't I a woman? (Grimstad & Rennie, 1973, p. 183)

The differences between the two movements is striking and may be attributed to a number of factors. One might observe differences in backgrounds, personality traits, social milieus and education levels. However, the inherent and environmental conditions imposed on an individual over a long period of time eventually become distilled into what may be termed as "values" and these values are often the primary motivating force behind people's behaviors and life choices.

Rokeach (1973) defines a value as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence" (p. 5). He defines a value system as "an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states or existence along a continuum of relative importance" (p. 5). He further

explains that value systems tend to be constructed in a hierarchy such that when one is presented with an occasion which requires choosing between two positive values, the way in which one ranks her/his values determines that choice. He believes that the values that make up value systems can be broken down into 36 separate values; 18 terminal values and 18 instrumental values. These values are:

Instrumental Values

Ambitious
Broadminded
Capable
Cheerful
Clean
Courageous
Forgiving
Helpful
Honest
Imaginative
Independent
Intellectual
Logical
Loving
Obedient
Polite
Responsible
Self-controlled

Terminal Values

A comfortable life
An exciting life
A sense of accomplishment
A world at peace
A world of beauty
Equality
Family security
Freedom
Happiness
Inner harmony
Mature love
National security
Pleasure
Salvation
Self-respect
Social recognition
True friendship
Wisdom

He defines terminal values as "desirable end-states of existence" and instrumental values as "desirable modes of conduct". He maintains further that terminal values may be broken down into social values and personal values. Social values refer to society-centered or interpersonal values. World peace and brotherhood would be examples of social values. Personal values

refer to self-centered or intrapersonal values. End-states such as peace of mind or salvation would be examples of personal values. He believes that instrumental values may be broken down into moral values and competence values. He maintains that the concept of moral values is considerably narrower than the general concept of values, and refers mainly to modes of behavior sufficient unto themselves rather than as means to arrive at end-states of existence. Also, moral values are such that their violation arouses feelings of guilt or wrongdoing. Competence or self-actualization values are not especially concerned with morality, and their violation generally arouses feelings of personal inadequacy rather than guilt. It is of interest to note that the moral values subsumed under instrumental values by Rokeach are generally comparable to the femininity scales constructed by other researchers, and that the competence values correspond to the masculinity values on the same scales (Bem, 1974; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson & Rosenkrantz, 1970).

The immediate functions of values and value systems are to aid daily functioning and decisions making while the long range functions are to give expression to human needs. Therefore, values have a strong motivational component as well as emotional, mental, and behavioral

components. Instrumental values are values which ideally aid in arriving at terminal values, or end-states. There is another reason that values may be said to be motivating. They are the means that human beings use to enhance self-esteem. Self-esteem is referred to by McDougal (1926) as the "master sentiment". Other writers have postulated ways in which values serve the sentiment of self-regard (Smith, Bruner & White, 1956; Katz, 1960). These authors were primarily concerned with attitudes rather than values. According to these authors, attitudes serve value-expressive, adjustment, ego-defensive and knowledge functions. All attitudes are considered to be value-expressive, and all values are considered to serve the function of maintaining and enhancing self-regard. Therefore, the latter three functions may be subsumed under the heading of value-expressive.

The "adjustment function" of values concerns instrumental and terminal values which are adjustment or utilitarian oriented. The instrumental values of getting along well with others, obedience, politeness, and self-control are examples of adjustment values. The terminal values of material comfort, success, prestige, and "law and order" are also adjustment values. Other values which have a more subtle relationship to

adjustment values are the instrumental values of responsible and achievement-oriented behavior and the terminal values of peace of mind and the security values of self, nation, and family. It has been suggested by McLaughlin (1965) that adjustment values are really "pseudo-values" as they are values adopted by people as ways of adapting to group pressure. It is unrealistic, however, to expect anyone to admit to the value of compliance, as this value would not be in service to the "master sentiment" of self-regard. Therefore, this internalized value is realized by the individual in more acceptable terms such as the striving for success or getting along well with others.

The "ego-defensive function" of values comes from psychoanalytic theory which maintains that needs, feelings and actions that are personally unacceptable to an individual may undergo a process of being unconsciously recast into other values through the vehicles of reaction formation and rationalization. All instrumental and terminal values may serve this function to some degree, but there are certain values which serve this function more directly than others. Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson & Sanford (1950) suggest that the instrumental values of cleanliness and politeness and the terminal values of family security and national

security readily lend themselves to ego-defense. These values, when given a high priority in the value system, suggest the authoritarian personality. Other researchers maintain that religious values often serve ego-defensive functions (Allen & Spilka, 1967; Allport, 1954; Allport & Ross, 1967; Glock & Stark, 1965, 1966; Kirkpatrick, 1949; Lenski, 1961; Rokeach, 1969a, 1969b).

The "knowledge" or "self-actualization" function of values is defined by Katz as "the search for meaning, the need to understand, the trend toward better organization of perception and belief to provide clarity and consistency" (1960, p. 170). The terminal values of wisdom and a sense of accomplishment reflect this function of values. The instrumental values of responsibility, competence and independence also reflect this function of values.

Maslow (1954) has constructed a theory of motivation which involves a hierarchal order. He maintains that it is possible to rank values such that they differentially serve safety, security, love, self-esteem, and self-actualization needs. He also refers to B(being)-values and D(deficiency)-values (1959), and proposes that certain values are of a higher order and more conducive to psychological fulfillment than others. These values are those that have the greatest poten-

tial for helping the individual to become self-actualized. Self-actualized individuals are less preoccupied with their own needs, and therefore are more inclined to direct their energies toward the social needs of the world. According to Rokeach (1973, p. 17):

To the extent that a person's value system reflects a differential preoccupation with values that are adjustive, ego-defensive, and self-actualizing, we may say that he is operating at lower or higher levels.

Therefore it may be concluded that adjustment and ego-defensive values may be subsumed under the heading of lower order values, while self-actualization and social values may be subsumed under the heading of higher order values.

Feminists and anti-feminists appear to differ considerably over the question of values, but there has been little or no research conducted involving this topic.

Based on the previous discussion of feminist and anti-feminist values and value systems combined with the research on values conducted by Rokeach, Maslow, and others; feminists are hypothesized to place stronger priority on higher order values and anti-feminists on lower-order values. Hypothesis 1: Feminists will rank instrumental competency values on the Rokeach Value Scale significantly higher than anti-feminists. These

values are: Ambitious, broadminded, capable, courageous, independent, logical, and intellectual.

Hypothesis 2: Anti-feminists will rank instrumental moral values on the Rokeach Value Scale higher than feminists. These values are: Cheerful, clean, forgiving, helpful, loving, obedient, and polite.

Hypothesis 3: Anti-feminists will rank the adjustment function cluster of values as specified by Rokeach (1973) significantly higher than feminists. The adjustment cluster of values includes the instrumental values consisting of: Cheerful, forgiving, helpful, loving, obedient, self-controlled, polite, and responsible. The terminal values included in this cluster are: A comfortable life, family security, national security, and social recognition.

Hypothesis 4: Anti-feminists will rank the ego-defensive cluster of values specified by Rokeach (1973) significantly higher than feminists. The instrumental values included in this cluster are: Polite and clean. the terminal values which are included in this cluster are: Family security, national security, and salvation.

Hypothesis 5: Feminists will rank the self-actualization cluster of values as specified by Rokeach (1973) significantly higher than anti-feminists. This value cluster consists of the instrumental values of: Broadminded,

courageous, imaginative, logical, independent, capable, and responsible. The terminal values included in this cluster are: A sense of accomplishment and wisdom.

Hypothesis 6: Feminists will rank the cluster of terminal values on the Rokeach Scale (1973) which are social values that apply to the world's population in general higher than anti-feminists. These terminal values are: A world at peace, a world of beauty, freedom, and equality.

METHOD

Subjects

Feminist Group. The feminist group consisted of 57 subjects, all adult female active members of the National Organization for Women (NOW) or San Diego, California. The data were collected at two separate meetings of NOW, which were held on Tuesday evenings. The president of NOW was contacted by telephone for permission to administer the survey. There were approximately 70 members present at each meeting. The first meeting rendered 31 subjects. There were 26 subjects participating at the second meeting. All subjects participated voluntarily. Two of the questionnaires from the first group of subjects proved to be unusable, leaving an N of 55 (See Table 1 for further demographic breakdown).

Anti-Feminist Group. The anti-feminist group consisted of 60 subjects, all adult female participants in Fascinating Womanhood Seminars. A total of 35 letters were mailed to Fascinating Womanhood Seminar leaders in southern California in an effort to locate subjects. The data were collected on two separate occasions. The first was a small seminar held in the evening in the

in the home of the seminar leader in San Diego, California. This seminar yielded 8 subjects. All those present participated. The second occasion was a large seminar held in the morning in the wing of the Nazarene Church in Long Beach, California. All those present participated, and this seminar yielded 51 subjects. From the latter group there was one survey packet that could not be included in the data since it was not completed properly, which made a total N of 59 (See Table 1 for further demographic breakdown).

Materials

A test packet containing a written instruction sheet, the Rokeach Value Survey, and a demographic questionnaire was presented to each subject (Appendix A). A form letter was also distributed to each subject explaining the purpose of the study (Appendix B). Pencils were provided upon request. A cardboard box was utilized as a receptacle for the completed packets. For those who wished to receive feedback information on how their group ranked the values on the survey a clipboard, paper and pen were placed next to the box for the subjects to record their names and addresses.

Procedure

Each group taking the survey received a brief in-

troduction from the group leader (NOW president and seminar instructors) stating that questionnaires were being distributed to the members which was to be used as data for the master's thesis in psychology, and that those who cared to participate may fill out questionnaires and deposit them by the door upon leaving. The experimenter was present, but did not have verbal contact with the subjects prior to the administration of the survey. Follow-up letters were mailed to all subjects who so requested feedback information. These letters consisted of a cover letter and a separate data sheet which gave the order in which each group ranked the values (Appendix C).

RESULTS

Demographic Data

The two groups were analyzed for demographic differences using a chi-square for contingency tables. It was found that there were no significant age differences between the two groups. There were significant differences between the two groups in religion, marital status, political affiliation, annual income, race and number of children (Table 1).

Hypotheses

Because the frequency distributions deviated so markedly from normality and from one another, it was determined that the measure of central tendency that was appropriate was the median rather than the mean (Rokeach, 1973). The non-parametric Median Test, a chi-square test of significance between the value rankings of subjects in two or more subgroups who ranked the values above or below a common group median, was selected as the measuring instrument¹. Composite median rankings and a summary of chi-square may be found in Table 2.

¹This was the instrument of choice used by Rokeach (1973) when testing under parallel conditions.

It was hypothesized that the feminist group would rate the instrumental competency values of ambitious, broadminded, capable, courageous, independent, logical and intellectual significantly higher than the anti-feminist group. The data support this hypothesis.

It was hypothesized that anti-feminists would rate the instrumental moral values of cheerful, clean, forgiving, helpful, loving, obedient and polite significantly higher than the feminist group. The data support this hypothesis.

It was hypothesized that the anti-feminist group would rate the adjustment-function cluster of values significantly higher than the feminist group. This cluster of values includes the instrumental values of cheerful, forgiving, helpful, loving, obedient, self-controlled, polite and responsible. The terminal values included in this cluster are a comfortable life, family security, national security and social recognition. The data support the hypothesis on all but three of the values. There were no significant differences between the rankings of the two groups on the instrumental value of responsible or the terminal value of a comfortable life. The feminist group rated the value of social recognition significantly higher than the anti-feminist group, in contrast to the expected

TABLE 1

Demographic Differences between Feminist Group and
Anti-Feminist Group and Summary of Chi-Square

AGE	20-29	30-39	40-49	50+			df	χ^2
F	17	19	8	11				
A/F	17	28	10	4			3	5.08
MARITAL STATUS	S	M	D	W			df	χ^2
F	11	28	14	2				
A/F	1	55	3	0			3	26.13****
RELIGION	None	Cath	Prot	Jew	Other		df	χ^2
F	27	5	11	3	9			
A/F	5	8	41	1	4		4	34.72****
POLITICAL AFFIL.	Dem	Rep	Ind	Other			df	χ^2
F	35	9	9	2				
A/F	21	20	11	7			3	10.52**
ANNUAL INCOME	Under 5M	5M-10M	10M-15M	15M-20M	Over 20M		df	χ^2
F	12	9	10	11	13			
A/F	1	7	8	16	27		4	15.48***
RACE	Cauc	Or	Negro	Latin	Other		df	χ^2
F	53	0	0	2	0			
A/F	56	1	0	1	1		3	2.28
CHILDREN	0	1	2	3	4+		df	χ^2
F	23	11	8	9	4			
A/F	9	12	17	10	11		5	12.87*
EDUCATION	-12yr	12yr	-16yr	16yr	+16yr	G. Degree	df	χ^2
F	0	3	21	10	4	17		
A/F	2	8	34	9	4	2	6	19.11***

*p.<.05

**p.<.02

***p.<.01

****p.<.001

outcome.

The fourth hypothesis predicted that the anti-feminist group would rank the ego-defensive cluster of values significantly higher than the feminist group. The values subsumed under the ego-defensive category include the terminal values of family security, national security and salvation; and the instrumental values of polite and clean. The data support this hypothesis.

It was hypothesized that feminists would rank the self-actualization cluster of values significantly higher than anti-feminists. This cluster consists of the instrumental values of broadminded, courageous, imaginative, logical, independent, capable and responsible. The terminal values in this cluster are a sense of accomplishment and wisdom. It was found that the feminist group did rank significantly higher than the anti-feminist group the instrumental values of broadminded, courageous, imaginative, logical, independent, and capable. There were no significant differences between the rankings of the two groups on the instrumental value of responsible. The data show that the feminist group ranked significantly higher than the anti-feminist group the terminal value of a sense of accomplishment, but there were no significant differences between the two group on the terminal value of wis-

TABLE 2

Composite Median Rankings of Feminist and Anti-Feminist
Groups and Summary of Chi-Square Median Test

VALUE	F ^a N=55	A/F ^a N=59	χ^2_M
Instrumental Values			
Ambitious	9.42 (11)	14.55 (17)	8.15**
Broadminded	6.25 (6)	10.87 (12)	13.97***
Capable	6.08 (4)	11.0 (11)	15.35***
Cheerful	13.38 (15)	8.29 (5)	23.65***
Clean	15.61 (16)	11.4 (13)	15.38***
Courageous	7.06 (7)	10.29 (9)	7.13**
Forgiving	12.57 (13)	3.71 (3)	56.08***
Helpful	11.44 (12)	8.92 (8)	6.60*
Honest	4.14 (2)	2.47 (2)	7.76**
Imaginative	8.25 (10)	12.8 (15)	16.37***
Independent	4.0 (1)	15.8 (18)	64.87***
Intellectual	4.67 (5)	11.8 (14)	22.03***
Logical	7.38 (9)	13.2 (16)	12.21***
Loving	7.75 (8)	1.73 (1)	33.85***
Obedient	17.85 (18)	7.0 (6)	51.36***
Polite	15.56 (17)	10.6 (10)	21.82***
Responsible	5.25 (3)	6.46 (4)	3.21
Self-controlled	13.2 (14)	9.12 (7)	7.87**
Terminal Values			
A comfortable life	13.14 (13)	13.64 (15)	.15
An exciting life	10.38 (10)	14.81 (16)	4.61*
A sense of accomplishment	4.42 (4)	11.29 (11)	35.87***
A world at peace	10.02 (9)	10.55 (10)	.04
A world of beauty	13.6 (15)	13.36 (14)	.03
Equality	3.8 (3)	11.71 (12-13)	36.47***
Family security	12.67 (12)	4.05 (4)	38.12***
Freedom	3.46 (2)	8.44 (9)	27.40***
Happiness	10.14 (11)	5.75 (6)	15.69***
Inner harmony	6.37 (7)	3.64 (2)	19.11***
Mature love	8.2 (8)	5.31 (3)	8.88**
National security	15.6 (17)	13.19 (12-13)	6.83**
Pleasure	11.58 (16)	14.33 (17)	2.98
Salvation	17.76 (18)	1.33 (1)	74.34***
Self-respect	3.82 (1)	4.89 (5)	3.63
Social recognition	11.7 (5)	15.94 (18)	6.75**
True friendship	7.71 (14)	8.0 (8)	.11
Wisdom	6.05 (6)	5.8 (7)	.38

Figures shown are median rankings and, in parentheses, composite rank orders.

*p.<.05
**p.<.01
***p.<.001

^aThe lower the rank, the higher the value.

dom.

The last hypothesis predicted that the feminists would rank the cluster of social values higher than the anti-feminists. This cluster consists of the terminal values of equality, freedom, a world at peace and a world of beauty. It was found that the feminist group did rank significantly higher than the anti-feminist group the values of equality and freedom. There were no significant differences between the two groups on the ranking of the values of a world of beauty and a world at peace.

Matched Group Results

Because of the strong relationship between feminism and level of education, a secondary analysis of matched groups for education level was done in order to illustrate that education, while being a factor, cannot solely explain the value differences between feminists and anti-feminists. The subjects were drawn from the original data pool and matched for education levels. Equivalent numbers of subjects from each level were used. A summary of the chi-square median test for this matched sample overall values may be found in Table 3.

The first hypothesis predicted that the feminist group would rank significantly higher than the anti-feminist group the instrumental competency values. These

values consist of ambitious, broadminded, capable, independent, logical, intellectual and courageous. The data show that the two groups ranked the values as predicted with the exception of the value of courageous. There were no significant differences between the ranking of the two groups on this value.

It was hypothesized that the anti-feminist group would rank significantly higher than the feminist group the instrumental moral values of cheerful, clean, forgiving, helpful, loving, obedient, and polite. The data supports this hypothesis.

It was predicted that the anti-feminists would rank the adjustment cluster of values significantly higher than the feminists. This cluster consists of the values of cheerful, forgiving, helpful, loving, obedient, polite, self-controlled, responsible, family security, a comfortable life, national security and social recognition. It was found that the anti-feminist group ranked as predicted the values of cheerful, forgiving, helpful, loving, obedient, polite and family security. There were no significant differences between the median rankings of the two groups on the values of self-control, responsible, a comfortable life, national security, or social recognition.

The fourth hypothesis predicted that the anti-fem-

inist group would rank the ego-defensive values higher than the feminist group. These values are polite, clean, family security, national security and salvation. The anti-feminist group ranked all of the values higher than the feminist group with the exception of the value of national security. There were no significant differences between the ranking of the two groups for this value.

It was hypothesized that the feminist group would rank significantly higher than the anti-feminist group the self-actualization values of broadminded, imaginative, logical, independent, courageous, responsible, a sense of accomplishment and wisdom. The two groups ranked the values as hypothesized except for the values of courageous, responsible and wisdom. There were no significant differences between the rankings of the two groups for these values.

It was predicted that the feminist group would rank significantly higher than the anti-feminist group the social values of equality, freedom, a world at peace and a world of beauty. The feminist group ranked the values of freedom and equality significantly higher than the anti-feminist group, but there were no significant differences between the two groups on the values of a world at peace and a world of beauty.

TABLE 3

Summary of Chi-Square Median Test of Feminist and Anti-Feminist Groups Matched for Education

VALUE	M
Instrumental Values	
Ambitious	10.32**
Broadminded	8.99**
Capable	5.45 *
Cheerful	18.52***
Clean	5.27*
Courageous	2.58
Forgiving	38.37***
Helpful	4.31*
Honest	3.39
Imaginative	5.27*
Independent	41.29***
Intellectual	13.71***
Logical	10.50**
Loving	28.15***
Obedient	30.85***
Polite	24.29***
Responsible	2.64
Self-controlled	1.32
Terminal Values	
A comfortable life	.21
An exciting life	8.89**
A sense of accomplishment	21.18***
A world at peace	.05
A world of beauty	.05
Equality	35.60***
Family security	19.21***
Freedom	21.18***
Happiness	7.63**
Inner harmony	4.28*
Mature love	5.36*
National security	3.37
Pleasure	.86
Salvation	57.96***
Self-respect	.21
Social recognition	3.49
True Friendship	.00
Wisdom	.05

*p. < .05

**p. < .01

***p. < .001

DISCUSSION

The present study was designed to test the differences, if any, between the values and value systems of feminists and anti-feminists. Several hypotheses were proposed, separating the values into competence values as opposed to moral values and higher order as opposed to lower order values, and predicting that feminists would assign higher ranks to competence (masculine) values and the higher order (self-actualization and social) values, while anti-feminists would assign higher ranks to the moral (feminine) values and the lower order (adjustment and ego-defensive) values.

As predicted, it was found that feminists do rank all the values subsumed under the masculinity/competency category significantly higher than anti-feminists, and anti-feminists ranked all of the values subsumed under the femininity/morality category significantly higher than feminists. Since the competency/masculinity values tend to be modes of behavior leading to end states, it might be concluded that feminists are more goal oriented in general than are the anti-feminists, and the data show that the feminists do rank the terminal values of social recognition and a sense of accomplishment sig-

nificantly higher than do the anti-feminists. Also, the violation of competency/masculinity values tend to arouse feelings of inadequacy, while the violation of morality/femininity values tend to arouse feelings of guilt and remorse. Perhaps it would be safe to conclude, therefore, that there is a qualitative difference in the emotional reactions in stressful situations between feminists and anti-feminists. If feminists value traditionally masculine traits, then it is possible that they react emotionally similar to men, while anti-feminists may react emotionally in traditionally feminine ways. Research has shown that when men suffer from emotional problems they tend to exhibit socially deviant symptoms, while women more often suffer from depression, paranoia, frigidity, and suicidal thoughts (Chesler, 1972). It would be interesting to see if, in fact, feminists and anti-feminists differ also in these ways.

While not every value subsumed under the category of adjustment values was ranked significantly higher by the anti-feminist group, nine out of twelve, or seventy-five percent, were. Of the three remaining values, two were ranked with no significant differences between the groups, and only one (social recognition) was in inverse relation to the original prediction.

Considering these results, one might reasonably conclude that anti-feminists do, in fact, attach higher priorities to values which provide a means of "getting along" or compliance than do feminists. The value of social recognition, while considered by Rokeach to be an adjustment value, cannot reflect an underlying value of compliance by itself. It seems more likely to be the natural outcome of the instrumental value of ambition, as previously discussed.

It was hypothesized that anti-feminists would grant a higher priority to those values subsumed under the category of ego-defensive values than the feminists would, and the data clearly support this hypothesis. This might suggest that anti-feminists tend to perceive themselves as being more fragile and vulnerable than do feminists. Conversely, one might conclude that feminists have stronger ego systems than do anti-feminists.

The feminist group ranked seven out of nine self-actualization values significantly higher than did the anti-feminists. There were no significant differences between the two groups on the remaining two values. The anti-feminist group did not rank any of the self-actualization values significantly higher than the feminist group did. From this one may conclude that feminists tend to be more self-actualized than anti-femi-

nists.

Of the four values subsumed under the category of social values, only two were ranked significantly higher by the feminist group. There were no significant differences between the rankings of the two groups on the remaining two values. This hypothesis was not supported and it is perhaps wise to draw no conclusions based on the data. It should be noted, however, that the anti-feminist group did not rank any of the social values significantly higher than the feminist group did. The two values ranked higher by the feminist group were freedom and equality, which is a basic premise of the feminist philosophy that these values would be ranked in such a manner.

In compiling the demographic data it was found that the feminists as a group were more highly educated than the anti-feminists as a group. It was then decided to extract from the data all of the subject questionnaires that were matched for education (N=76). This was accomplished in order to demonstrate that the differences between the rankings of the groups could not be accounted for solely on the basis of education. The results of this analysis substantiated this premise (See Table 5).

Of the individual instrumental values, the greatest

difference between the two groups was found on the value of independence. It would appear from the data that feminists not only value independence more, but do so to a significantly high degree. There were also strikingly large differences on the values of forgiveness and obedience, with anti-feminists valuing these traits much higher than feminists.

The greatest differences found among the terminal values were those of equality and salvation. It is not surprising that the feminist group would rank equality very high, while the anti-feminists ranked it very low. Their respective philosophies command such priorities.

It is interesting to note that the feminist group ranked equality (3) and freedom (2) very high, while the anti-feminist group ranked equality (12-13, tied with national security) and freedom (9) relatively low. Rokeach (1973) has compiled a large body of evidence that suggests that one's basic political orientation can be predicted from the ways in which a person ranks these two values. He breaks these political orientations down into four basic groups consisting of communism (freedom low, equality high), capitalism (freedom high, equality low), socialism (freedom high, equality high), and fascism (freedom low, equality low). Based on this premise, it might be concluded that fem-

inists lean toward socialism while anti-feminists lean toward fascism/capitalism. Perhaps salvation was the most striking difference found between the two groups. The anti-feminist group ranked it first, while the feminist group ranked it last. Religion plays a very important role in the lives and philosophies of anti-feminists, and the demographic data show that the majority of anti-feminists are Protestant, and salvation plays a major role in Protestant beliefs.

The demographic data were of interest. The anti-feminist group seemed generally more homogeneous than did the feminist group (See Table 1). The feminists tended to have fewer children than the anti-feminists; were more often democrats than the anti-feminists; and there were many more single, widowed, and divorced subjects among the feminists. The anti-feminist group tended to have higher income levels than the feminist group, but it should be noted that the incomes claimed in the demographic data may have been the combined incomes of husbands and wives. Rokeach has studied the relationship between income levels and values (1973). As previously stated, the feminist group had significantly lower income levels than the anti-feminist group, yet the ways in which they ranked the values were often times opposite of the ways in which the rich and poor

ranked values. He found that the value of cleanliness, for instance, declined in value as income levels increased. Just the opposite relationship was found between feminists and anti-feminist. Similarly converse results were found for the values of cheerful, forgiving, helpful, obedient, polite, sense of accomplishment, family security, inner harmony, mature love, capable, imaginative, intellectual, logical and salvation. This might suggest that when ideologies are involved, they exert a greater influence than external criteria such as income levels on the value of people. Both groups were almost exclusively caucasian, which might suggest that both movements are basically white, middle-class phenomena. The differences between the two groups in education have already been discussed previously in this section.

Because of the significant differences found between feminists and anti-feminists on the competency (masculine) and moral (feminine) values, it might be intuitively thought that the differences between the values of American men and women would closely parallel those of feminists and anti-feminists. In comparing the data from this study to those found by Rokeach (1973) between American men and women, it was found that the differences between the rank ordering of values of

feminists and anti-feminists were wider than those between American men and women, though not always in the expected way. The instrumental competency values were assigned a higher rank by men in comparison to women with the exception of the value of responsible, which was tied (3). These aforementioned values are ambitious, broadminded, capable, courageous, independent, intellectual, logical, and self-controlled. It was also observed that women tended to assign higher ranks to the instrumental moral values than did the men with the exception of the values of polite and helpful, which were tied. These aforementioned values are cheerful, clean, forgiving, loving and obedient. However, in comparing men and women to feminists and anti-feminists, it was found that there are a number of striking differences. It was observed that the rank order assigned to the value of ambition was much higher for men (2) and women (4) than for either feminists (11) or for anti-feminists (17). Similar differences were found for the values of broadminded and courageous.

It was of interest to note that, among the terminal values, men assigned a much higher rank to a comfortable life (4) than did women (13), feminists (13) or anti-feminists (15). Judging from this evidence, it would appear that American men in general value comfort more

than American women of any ideological persuasion. It was also noted that men and women both ranked a world at peace very high (1) while feminists and anti-feminists ranked it in the middle range (9 and 10 respectively). This may be attributed to the fact that this country was at war at the time of the Rokeach study, while the study of feminists and anti-feminists occurred several years after the Viet Nam War had ended. The value of freedom was ranked very high by both men and women (3), while feminists ranked it even higher (2) and anti-feminists ranked it relatively low (9). However, men and women did not rank equality as high (9 and 8 respectively). Feminists ranked it much higher (3) and anti-feminists ranked it lower (12-13, tie). It has been previously mentioned elsewhere in this paper that according to Rokeach, one's general political orientation can be predicted from how these two values are ranked. It would appear that while feminists are socialist oriented and anti-feminists are fascist/capitalist oriented, American men and women tend to have capitalist orientations. It was also observed that feminists tend to value self-respect (1) more than men (6), women (6) or anti-feminists (5). In general, it was found that men (10) and women (11) value national security more than feminists (17) or anti-feminists (12-13, tie),

but this again may be connected to the reality of war at the time the male-female study was conducted. Both feminists (8) and anti-feminists (3) appear to value mature love more highly than men (14) or women (14) in our society. (See Table 4 for a complete comparison of rank orders for the four groups).

The results of this study show that the differences between the values and value systems of feminists and anti-feminists are drastically divergent, perhaps even more divergent than was originally anticipated. In fact, the differences between the groups were as wide or wider than the differences found by Rokeach (1973, pp. 57-58) between American men and American women. These differences may explain in part the communication breakdown that seems to occur between the two groups. Rational argument alone can have little value when the underlying values that these arguments are based differ so drastically. There has been very little research conducted in the area of values in the feminist and anti-feminist movements. Perhaps the rhetoric of the two movements, and the understanding of their respective philosophies, could be considerably improved if such research was undertaken and applied more often.

TABLE 4

Comparison of Rank Ordering of Values Between American
Men and Women and Feminists and Anti-Feminists

VALUE	MEN ^a	WOMEN ^a	F	A/F
Instrumental Values				
Ambitious	2	4	11	17
Broadminded	4	5	6	12
Capable	8	12	4	11
Cheerful	12	10	15	5
Clean	9	8	16	13
Courageous	5	6	7	9
Forgiving	6	2	13	3
Helpful	7	7	12	8
Honest	1	1	2	2
Imaginative	18	18	10	15
Independent	11	14	1	18
Intellectual	15	16	5	14
Logical	16	17	9	16
Loving	14	9	8	1
Obedient	17	15	18	6
Polite	13	13	17	10
Responsible	3	3	3	4
Self-controlled	10	11	14	7
Terminal Values				
A comfortable life	4	13	13	15
An exciting life	18	18	10	16
A sense of accomplishment	7	10	4	11
A world at peace	1	1	9	10
A world of beauty	15	15	15	14
Equality	9	8	3	12-13 tie
Family security	2	2	12	4
Freedom	3	3	2	9
Happiness	5	5	11	6
Inner harmony	13	12	7	2
Mature love	14	14	8	3
National security	10	11	17	12-13 tie
Pleasure	17	16	16	17
Salvation	11	4	18	1
Self-respect	6	6	1	5
Social recognition	16	17	5	18
True friendship	11	9	14	8
Wisdom	8	7	6	7

^aRokeach, 1973

APPENDIX A

Contents of the Value Survey Packet

Instructions

On the next page are 18 values listed in alphabetical order. Your task is to arrange them in order of their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life.

Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important for you.

Then pick out the value which is second most important for you. Then do the same for each of the remaining values. The value which is least important goes in Box 18.

Work slowly and think carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. The end result should truly show how you really feel.

Value Survey: Terminal Values

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 1 _____ | A comfortable life
(a prosperous life) |
| 2 _____ | An exciting life
(a stimulating, active life) |
| 3 _____ | A sense of accomplishment
(lasting contribution) |
| 4 _____ | A world at peace
(free of war and conflict) |
| 5 _____ | A world of beauty (beauty of
nature and the arts) |
| 6 _____ | Equality (brotherhood, equal
opportunity for all) |
| 7 _____ | Family security (taking care
of loved ones) |
| 8 _____ | Freedom (independence, free
choice) |
| 9 _____ | Happiness (contentedness) |
| 10 _____ | Inner Harmony (freedom from
inner conflict) |

- 11 _____ Mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
- 12 _____ National security (protection from attack)
- 13 _____ Pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
- 14 _____ Salvation (saved, eternal life)
- 15 _____ Self-respect (self-esteem)
- 16 _____ Social recognition (respect, admiration)
- 17 _____ True friendship (close companionship)
- 18 _____ Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)

Value Survey: Instrumental Values

- 1 _____ Ambitious (hard-working, aspiring)
- 2 _____ Broadminded (openminded)
- 3 _____ Capable (competent, effective)
- 4 _____ Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful)
- 5 _____ Clean (neat, tidy)
- 6 _____ Courageous (standing up for your beliefs)
- 7 _____ Forgiving (willing to pardon others)
- 8 _____ Helpful (working for the welfare of others)
- 9 _____ Honest (sincere, truthful)
- 10 _____ Imaginative (daring, creative)
- 11 _____ Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
- 12 _____ Intellectual (intelligent, reflective)
- 13 _____ Logical (consistent, rational)
- 14 _____ Loving (affectionate, tender)
- 15 _____ Obedient (dutiful, respectful)

- 16 _____ Polite (courteous, well-mannered)
- 17 _____ Responsible (dependable, reliable)
- 18 _____ Self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined)

- 16 _____ Polite (courteous, well-mannered)
17 _____ Responsible (dependable, reliable)
18 _____ Self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined)

Information Sheet

AGE: 20-29 yrs ___ 30-39 yrs ___ 40-49 yrs ___ 50+ yrs ___

MARITAL STATUS: S ___ M ___ D ___ W ___

RELIGION: Cath ___ Prot ___ Jew ___ None ___ Non-Trad ___

ANNUAL INCOME: \$5,000 ___ 5-10,000 ___ 10-15,000 ___
15-20,000 ___ 20,000+ ___

POLITICAL AFFILIATION: Dem ___ Rep ___ Ind ___ Other ___

RACE: Cauc ___ Oriental ___ Negro ___ Latin ___ Other ___

NO. CHILDREN: 0 ___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4+ ___

EDUCATION: Some HS ___ HS Grad ___ Some Coll ___ Coll Grad ___
Some Grad ___ Grad degree ___

APPENDIX B

Instructions for Experimental Conditions

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide data for a thesis to complete the requirements for a Master of Arts degree in psychology. It is a social psychology thesis designed to explore the values of American women. There are no wrong answers. All of the values are positive values, and our interest is only in how they are ranked. The personal data sheet attached to the back of the value survey is to give us some idea of how different groups (age, etc.) may or may not rank values differently. All questionnaires are strictly anonymous.

After you have completed the questionnaire, please deposit it in the box near the door. If you choose not to fill out the questionnaire, please leave it blank, but place it in the box, anyway. If you have already filled out one of these questionnaires previously, please do not fill out another one.

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX C

Feedback Information Mailed to Subjects

Cover Letter

Enclosed is the result of the questionnaire that your group completed for me for my thesis work in values. It has taken me quite a long time to collect all of my data, so I apologize for my slowness in reporting the results to you. Thank you very much for cooperating with me in the compilation of my thesis data.

Feminist Value Survey Results

There were 55 subjects tabulated in this data. Below are the values in the order in which your group ranked them.

TERMINAL VALUES

1. Self-respect
2. Freedom
3. Equality
4. A sense of accomplishment
5. Social recognition
6. Wisdom
7. Inner harmony
8. Mature love
9. A world at peace
10. An exciting life
11. Happiness
12. Family Security
13. A comfortable life
14. True friendship
15. A world of beauty
16. Pleasure
17. National security
18. Salvation

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

1. Independent
2. Honest
3. Responsible
4. Capable
5. Intellectual
6. Broadminded
7. Courageous
8. Loving
9. Logical
10. Imaginative
11. Ambitious
12. Helpful
13. Forgiving
14. Self-controlled
15. Cheerful
16. Clean
17. Polite
18. Obedient

Anti-Feminist Value Survey Results

There were 59 subjects tabulated in this data. Below are the values in the order in which your group ranked

TERMINAL VALUES

1. Salvation
2. Inner harmony
3. Mature love
4. Family security
5. Self-respect
6. Happiness
7. Wisdom
8. True friendship
9. Freedom
10. A world at peace
11. A sense of accomplishment
- 12-13. (tied) National Security, Equality
14. A world of beauty
15. A comfortable life
16. An exciting life
17. Pleasure
18. Social recognition

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

1. Loving
2. Honest
3. Forgiving
4. Responsible
5. Cheerful
6. Obedient
7. Self-controlled
8. Helpful
9. Courageous
10. Polite
11. Capable
12. Broadminded
13. Clean
14. Intellectual
15. Imaginative
16. Logical
17. Ambitious
18. Independent

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T.W.; Frenkel-Brunswik, E; Levinson, D.J.; & Sanford, R.N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Allen, R.O. & Spilka, B. Committed and consensual religion: A specification of religion-prejudice relationship. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1967, 6, 191-206.
- Allport, G.W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Allport, G.W. and Ross, J.M. Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 432-443.
- Andelin, H.B. Fascinating Womanhood. New York: Bantam Books, 1965.
- Bem, S. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. & Bem, D. Training a woman to know her place: The power of an unconscious ideology. In Garskoff, M.H. (Ed.), Roles Women Play: Readings Toward Women's Liberation. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing, 1971.
- Bernard, J. Women, Wives, Mothers. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1975.
- Bird, C. Born Female. New York: David McKay, 1968.
- Broverman, I.K.; Vogel, S.R.; Broverman, D.M.; Clarkson, F.E.; & Rosenkrantz, P.S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.
- Chesler, P. Women in Madness. New York: Avon Books, 1972.
- Cronan, S. Marriage. In Koedt, A.; Levine, E.; & Rapone, (Eds.) Radical Feminism. New York: Quadrangle

Books, 1973.

Firestone, S. The Dialectic of Sex. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.

Friedan, B. The Feminine Mystique. New York: Dell Publishing, 1963.

Glock, C.Y. & Stark, R. Religion and Society in Tension. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Glock, C.Y. & Stark, R. Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism. New York: Harper, 1966.

Grmistad, K. & Rennie, S. (Eds.) The New Woman's Survival Catalog. New York: Berkley Publishing, 1973.

Katz, D. The functional approach to the study of attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 163-204.

Kirkpatrick, C. Religion and humanitarianism: A study of institutional implications. Psychological Monographs, 1949, 63, (Whole No. 304).

Lenski, G. The Religious Factor. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961.

McDougal, W. An Introduction to Social Psychology. Boston: John W. Luce, 1926.

McLauglin, B. Values in behavioral science. Journal of Religion and Health, 1965, 4, 256-279.

Morgan, M. Total Woman. Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming Revell, 1973.

Maslow, A. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1954.

Maslow, A. New Knowledge in Human Values. New York: Harper, 1954.

Maslow, A. Toward a Psychology of Being (2nd ed.). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1968.

Pierce, C. Natural Law Language and Women. In Gornich, V. & Moran, B.K. (Eds.), Woman in Sexist Society. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Rokeach, M. Value systems in religion. Review of Reli-

gious Research, 1969, 11, 3-23. (a)

Rokeach, M. Religious values and social compassion.
Review of Religious Research, 1969, 11, 24-38. (b)

Rokeach, M. The Nature of Human Values. New York:
The Free Press, 1973.

Smith, M.B.; Bruner, J.S.; & White, R.W. Opinions and
Personality. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1956.

Weisstein, N. Psychology Constructs the Female. In
Gornich, V. & Moran, B.K. (Eds.) Woman in Sexist
Society. New York: Basic Books, 1971.